

surviving Member of Congress of the original New Deal Congress that came in in 1933. And every West Virginian who heard him speak treasures the memory of hearing him recount being called to the White House in the first 100 days with the banks closing, businesses closing, pensions being dissolved.

I can still hear Senator Randolph's tones as he talked about how Franklin Roosevelt rallied the country. And of course, Senator Randolph was there for the creation of Social Security, for the WPA, for economic recovery, and to create many of the institutions that we take for granted today. Yes, he was a builder, a builder of highways and infrastructure, a creator and preserver of the Appalachian Regional Commission, as well as creating educational opportunities, too.

No matter how many years Jennings Randolph had in his life, he always fought for young people. That is why he was a tireless battler for the 26th Amendment to the Constitution, which in the early 1970s gave the right to vote to those between the ages of 18 and 21. The last speech I ever heard Senator Randolph give was lamenting low voter turnout in our country and challenging all of us, all of us as citizens, to be able to go to the polls and exercise our most precious franchise.

Mr. Speaker, we West Virginians have much to remember in this gentle man. When we drive along on a modern four-lane road or we go to a job training class, when we make use of an Appalachian Regional Commission facility, perhaps a health clinic, when we turn on our spigot and we get fresh water, or perhaps when we retire and we know that Social Security will be there, and of course for the youth, the youth that Jennings Randolph believed in so much that he fought and won for them the right to vote.

Mr. Speaker, a gentle man with a great heart comes home to rest today, and all West Virginia gives thanks for this rich and meaningful life.

AMERICAN TECHNOLOGY TRANSFERS TO CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, outrage is sweeping the United States of America, and a justifiable outrage. The American people are finding out now that the technology that they paid for with their tax dollars to be developed during the Cold War, that some of that technology has been transferred to the communist Chinese in order to upgrade the capabilities of their nuclear weapons delivery system.

When President Clinton became President of the United States, we had a chance to confront any wrongdoing or aggression or belligerency commit-

ted by the communist Chinese, knowing that the people of the United States were not at risk. Now, after 5 years, we find almost miraculously that the Chinese have developed the capability of hitting the United States with nuclear weapons.

The outrage that I talked about, as I suggested, comes from the fact that we are now learning that it was American corporations, some moguls from the aerospace industry, who decided to take American technology and improve those Chinese rockets. Then we find out that this administration, inside the administration, the watchdogs that noticed that this illegal act and immoral act was taking place, that when the watchdogs tried to create and tried to establish an investigation and to prosecute those people who had transferred that missile technology, that their effort was undercut by no one else but the President of the United States.

President Bill Clinton took the steps that were necessary to transfer the authority of blocking some certain transfers of technology from the State Department, which opposed that transfer, to the Commerce Department that was headed by Ron Brown which was interested in facilitating transfers of technology. The President also issued waivers and licenses that undercut those people who were preparing the prosecution of those people in the aerospace industry that transferred that technology to the communist Chinese.

And yes, there is one other step in this story of betrayal, and that is the information that now is emerging that the President of the United States, during his reelection effort, received millions of dollars in contributions from those who were transferring this technology, in the same time period that the waivers and licenses were being issued by the Oval Office in order to facilitate those transfers.

Bernard Swartz, the CEO of Lorel Corporation, the corporation that transferred much of this technology, is the biggest contributor to the President's reelection campaign, over a million dollars to the President's reelection or to the Democratic party. And then, of course, we hear about money coming from the communist Chinese themselves, filtering it into the President's reelection campaign, Johnny Chung just a few days ago admitting that the \$100,000 he tried to funnel into the Democratic campaign came from the People's Liberation Army.

I would ask my colleagues to pay attention to this story, because the People's Liberation Army, the source of those funds was not just the army itself, it was that part of the communist Chinese army that deals with missile and rocket development. A lieutenant colonel in the Chinese Army gave that money to Johnny Chung to funnel into the President's campaign.

Yes, there is justifiable outrage. The President has a lot of questions to answer, as do these corporations, both on moral grounds and on legal grounds.

The President should cancel his trip to China until those questions have been answered, and there should be a moratorium on all presidential actions concerning waivers and licenses and the shipping of technology to communist China until we get to the bottom of this.

Every man, woman, and child in the United States now is in jeopardy of nuclear incineration by the communist Chinese if we ever do confront them in their wrongdoing, because of technology that has been transferred to them with the help of this President and with the profit of American companies making profit off technology developed by the taxpayers for the protection of our country.

This is the most serious scandal that I have heard. Maybe the American people cannot understand what sex scandal and character has to do with making decisions, but this is very understandable. Our country has been betrayed. We need to get to the bottom of it.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 4 minutes.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to rise today with my good friends and colleagues, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. WISE) in tribute to a fine gentleman and faithful advocate of the people of West Virginia.

I am speaking, of course, of Senator Jennings Randolph, whose lifetime of distinguished service came to an end just 11 days ago. We all mourn his passing, and certainly we send our deepest sympathies to his family. Our thoughts are with them in these difficult days. While recovering from such a loss is a painful process, we hope they find comfort in the legacy he leaves behind, for it truly is a remarkable one.

On the day after Senator Randolph's death, newspapers across the State recounted his inspiring story, the story of a young journalist who was elected to Congress as a New Deal Democrat and would become the last member of the storied class that served in the first 100 days of FDR's presidency. He was thrust into the House during an extraordinary time in our Nation's history, a time of despair, sorrow, and suffering, and he was a part of the extraordinary solution, the package of reforms that revised our Nation, bringing sustenance, opportunity, and hope to millions.

Jennings Randolph never lost that passion for helping those who needed help the most, especially the poor and disabled. The young New Deal Democrat would become a mature hand in the great society, never wavering in his

belief that government can and should play an active role in solving people's problems, and he worked mightily to better his home State of West Virginia.

Senator Randolph was a champion of the interstate highway system, the Appalachian Regional Commission, local airports, and countless infrastructure projects that brought the basics to our people. That is how he thought of himself, once saying, "I essentially am a West Virginia senator. I'm not what you'd call a national Senator or international Senator."

It is true that Jennings Randolph was an effective, tireless advocate of West Virginia. But if my colleagues think that he did not have an influence on this Nation, they would be badly mistaken. After all, it was Jennings Randolph who authored the constitutional amendment that gave 18-year-olds the right to vote. And in so many other areas, his work and support was crucial to policies that advantaged citizens from coast to coast. Throughout his service in the House and then in the Senate, he was a model of courtesy, of grace and professionalism.

As the Senate historian said so well, "Very few senatorial careers was as full as his. He always struck me," the historian, "as the image of a Senator's Senator, a teacher within the institution who would take young Senators beneath his wing and lecture them, sometimes gently and sometimes not so gently, about the importance of etiquette."

□ 1100

Mr. Speaker, with Jennings Randolph passing, the people of West Virginia have lost a great friend and representative. We salute his lasting record of achievement and honor his memory as a passionate, dedicated public servant.

WELLER-McINTOSH II MARRIAGE TAX COMPROMISE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, questions are often asked in this body, and I think one of the most important questions asked is: Why is enactment of the Marriage Tax Elimination Act so important for working families in America? I think this series of questions best illustrates why.

Do Americans feel that it is fair that our tax code imposes a higher tax penalty on marriage? Do Americans feel that it is fair that 21 million married working couples on average pay \$1,400 more a year just because they are married, \$1,400 more than an identical couple that lives together outside of marriage?

Do Americans feel that it is right that our Tax Code actually provides an incentive to get divorced because the only way today to avoid the marriage

tax penalty is to get divorced and to live together outside of marriage?

Clearly, Americans feel that the marriage tax penalty is not only unfair, it is wrong. It is immoral that our Tax Code punishes society's most basic institution. The Congressional Budget Office tells us that 21 million married working couples pay an average of \$1,400 more just because they are married.

Let me give you an example of a couple in the south suburbs. I represent the south side of Chicago and the south suburbs of Chicago and Illinois. I have an example here of a south suburban couple, working man and working woman, who pay the marriage tax penalty.

The gentleman is a machinist at Caterpillar where they make the big equipment, the heavy earth-moving equipment. This machinist makes \$30,500 a year. Under the current Tax Code, if you add in the standard deduction and exemption, he is taxed at the 15 percent rate.

Say this machinist meets a schoolteacher a tenured schoolteacher in the Joliet public schools. The schoolteacher has an identical income. She would be in the 15 percent tax rate if she stays single. But if they choose to get married, if they choose to live in holy matrimony, under our Tax Code, this married working couple, a machinist at Caterpillar and a schoolteacher in the Joliet public schools who choose to get married, will pay the average marriage tax penalty of almost \$1,400.

In Washington, D.C., \$1,400 is just a drop in the bucket. But in Joliet, Illinois, in the south suburb of Chicago, \$1,400 for this machinist and schoolteacher is real money, real money for real people: one year's tuition at Joliet Junior College, 3 months of day care at the local day care center in Joliet; and it is also several months' worth of car payments. That is real money that Uncle Sam is taking away from this machinist and this schoolteacher just because they are married.

We have a solution. We believe that elimination of the marriage tax penalty should be our number one priority as we address the tax provisions in this year's balanced budget which will be, hopefully, the second balanced budget in over a generation.

The Marriage Tax Elimination Act, which is now called the compromise as well as Weller-McIntosh II, it is pretty simple. What it does is it doubles the standard deduction for those who do not itemize from \$4,150 for a single person, \$8,300 for a married couple, simply doubling it, helping eliminate the marriage penalty.

Also, for the five tax brackets, we double the income threshold for couples. Currently, you are in the 15 percent tax bracket if you make \$24,650. We double that to \$49,300, eliminating the marriage penalty. Because, currently, even if you are making \$24,650, our current Tax Code, you can only make \$42,000. So there is about an

\$8,000 marriage tax penalty in the 15 percent tax bracket.

We want to eliminate the marriage tax penalty. The Marriage Tax Elimination Act of 1998 accomplishes that goal. We believe it should be the centerpiece of this year's balanced budget plan.

There are always competing ideas, and President Clinton has a good idea. He says our priority should be expanding the current child care tax credit. Under the President's child care tax credit, the average family that will qualify would see about an extra \$368 in total take-home pay a year.

If we eliminate the marriage tax penalty for that machinist and schoolteacher, they would see an extra \$1,400 in take-home pay. So let us think about that which is better. If we eliminate the marriage tax penalty, \$1,400 will pay for almost 3 months of child care at a local day care center in Joliet. If we forget about eliminating the marriage tax penalty and just do the expanding the current child tax credit, the President's \$358 will pay for 3 weeks worth of day care in Joliet, Illinois. So which is better, 3 weeks or 3 months?

Clearly, elimination of the marriage tax penalty is a better deal for working couples and working married couples throughout America.

What is the bottom line? We want to eliminate the marriage tax penalty. It is wrong that our Tax Code punishes society's most basic institution. It is time that we stop punishing marriage.

We think about it. This Congress in the last 3 years has made helping families by raising take-home pay a real priority. We strengthened families by providing the adoption tax credit in 1996 so that families who hope to provide a loving home for a child in need of adoption can better afford it.

In 1997, we provided the \$500 per child tax credit which will benefit 3 million children in Illinois, an extra \$1½ billion in higher take-home pay that will stay in Illinois rather than coming to Washington.

Let us eliminate the marriage tax penalty. \$1,400 is real money for real people. Let us make elimination of the marriage tax penalty the centerpiece of this year's budget agreement.

OLDER AMERICANS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ) is recognized during morning hour debates for 2 minutes.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, May is Older Americans Month, which gives us the special opportunity to honor our Nation's seniors. The theme of this month is living longer and growing stronger in America; and we are saluting the growing numbers of Americans who enjoy increased longevity and continue to contribute to their families, their communities and to this country.